

From: Patricia Ewers
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 30, 2003 5:19 PM
Subject: FCC should do more re: wireless

Patricia Ewers
5232 Katrina Ct.
Castro Valley, CA 94546

March 30, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

As a consumer, I believe the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should do more to improve the services provided by wireless phone companies. Left on its own, the industry has not provided an acceptable level of service.

The FCC needs to:

- Set service and billing standards, or let states set their own standards. I want an accurate and understandable bill. Get rid of the fine print and 'gotcha' clauses in cell phone contracts.
- Help me compare offers when I'm shopping for service by requiring standard, plain language disclosures of prices and terms in an easy to use format, similar to nutrition labels on food or the required disclosures on credit card offers.
- Require carriers to provide useful coverage maps, or disclose in some manner "dead zones" that consumers are likely to encounter in their local calling area.
- Ensure I have real choice by enforcing the number portability deadline of November 2003, so I can keep my phone number if I change carriers.
- Require carriers to grant new customers a reasonable trial period, allowing them to return the phone and cancel a service contract, without penalty, if they wish.
- Expand options for 911 use by requiring phones to use any strong analog signal available to it, Require the cell phone industry to stop dragging their feet in implementing wireless enhanced 911 (which will allow emergency call centers to locate callers.)

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Patricia Ewers

From: Johnny Robey
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 30, 2003 10:21 PM
Subject: FCC should do more re: wireless

Johnny Robey
5215 Shadow Ct.
Jefferson City, MO 65109

March 30, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

As a consumer, I believe the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should do more to improve the services provided by wireless phone companies. **Let** on its own, the industry has not provided an acceptable level of service.

The FCC needs to:

- Set service and billing standards, or let states set their own standards. I want an accurate and understandable bill. Get rid of the fine print and 'gotcha' clauses in cell phone contracts.
- Help me compare offers when I'm shopping for service by requiring standard, plain language disclosures of prices and terms in an easy to use format, similar to nutrition labels on food or the required disclosures on credit card offers.
- Require carriers to provide useful coverage maps, or disclose in some manner "dead zones" that consumers are likely to encounter in their local calling area.
- Ensure I have real choice by enforcing the number portability deadline of November 2003, so I can keep my phone number if I change carriers,
- Require carriers to grant new customers a reasonable trial period, allowing them to return the phone and cancel a service contract, without penalty, if they wish.
- Expand options for 911 use by requiring phones to use any strong analog signal available to it. Require the cell phone industry to stop dragging their feet in implementing wireless enhanced 911 (which will allow emergency call centers to locate callers.)

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Johnny Robey

From: Cheryl Carlton
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 1, 2003 9:08 AM
Subject: FCC should do more re: wireless

Cheryl Carlton
6721 Armstrong Ct
Fort Worth, TX 76137

April 1, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

As a consumer, I believe the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should *do* more to improve the services provided by wireless phone companies. Left on its own, the industry has not provided an acceptable level of service.

The FCC needs to:

- Set service and billing standards, or let states **set** their own standards. I want an accurate and understandable bill. Get rid of the fine print and 'gotcha' clauses in cell phone contracts.
- Help me compare offers when I'm shopping for service by requiring standard, plain language disclosures of prices and terms in an easy to use format, similar to nutrition labels on food or the required disclosures on credit card offers.
- Require carriers to provide useful coverage maps, or disclose in some manner "dead zones" that consumers are likely to encounter in their local calling area.
- Ensure I have real choice by enforcing the number portability deadline of November 2003, so I can keep my phone number if I change carriers.
- Require carriers to grant new customers a reasonable trial period, allowing them to return the phone and cancel a service contract, without penalty, if they wish.
- Expand options for 911 use by requiring phones to use any strong analog signal available to it. Require the cell phone industry to stop dragging their feet in implementing wireless enhanced 911 (which will allow emergency call centers to locate callers.)

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Cheryl Carlton

From: Laura LaBarbera
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 1, 2003 12:38 PM
Subject: FCC should do more re: wireless

Laura LaBarbera
15 Rickland Drive
Randolph, NJ 07869

April 1, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

As a consumer, I believe the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should do more to improve the services provided by wireless phone companies. Left on its own, the industry has not provided an acceptable level of service.

The FCC needs to:

- Set service and billing standards, or let states set their own standards. I want an accurate and understandable bill. Get rid of the fine print and 'gotcha' clauses in cell phone contracts.
- Require cell phone manufacturers to improve the safety and reliability of their products.
- Help me compare offers when I'm shopping for service by requiring standard, plain language disclosures of prices and terms in an easy to use format, similar to nutrition labels on food or the required disclosures on credit card offers.
- Require carriers to provide useful coverage maps, or disclose in some manner "dead zones" that consumers are likely to encounter in their local calling area.
- Ensure I have real choice by enforcing the number portability deadline of November 2003, so I can keep my phone number if I change carriers
- Require carriers to grant new customers a reasonable trial period, allowing them to return the phone and cancel a service contract, without penalty, if they wish.
- Expand options for 911 use by requiring phones to use any strong analog signal available to it. Require the cell phone industry to stop dragging their feet in implementing wireless enhanced 911 (which will allow emergency call centers to locate callers.)

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Laura Labarbera

From: Gregory Heller
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 2, 2003 12:03 AM
Subject: FCC should do more re: wireless

Gregory Heller
455 FDR Drive B 1604
NY, NY 10002

April 2, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

As a consumer, I believe the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should do more to improve the services provided by wireless phone companies. Left on its own, the industry has not provided an acceptable level of service.

The FCC needs to:

- Set service and billing standards, or let states set their own standards. I want an accurate and understandable bill. Get rid of the fine print and 'gotcha' clauses in cell phone contracts.
- Help me compare offers when I'm shopping for service by requiring standard, plain language disclosures of prices and terms in an easy to use format, similar to nutrition labels on food or the required disclosures on credit card offers.
- Require carriers to provide useful coverage maps, or disclose in some manner "dead zones" that consumers are likely to encounter in their local calling area.
- Ensure I have real choice by enforcing the number portability deadline of November 2003, so I can keep my phone number if I change carriers
- Require carriers to grant new customers a reasonable trial period, allowing them to return the phone and cancel a service contract, without penalty, if they wish.
- Expand options for 911 use by requiring phones to use any strong analog signal available to it. Require the cell phone industry to stop dragging their feet in implementing wireless enhanced 911 (which will allow emergency call centers to locate callers.)

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Gregory Heller

From: Gregory Heller
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 2, 2003 12:04 AM
Subject: FCC should do more re: wireless

Gregory Heller
455 FDR Drive B 1604
NY, NY 10002

April 2, 2003

Chair Michael Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-AZ04
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

As a consumer, I believe the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should do more to improve the services provided by wireless phone companies. Left on its own, the industry has not provided an acceptable level of service.

The FCC needs to:

- Set service and billing standards, or let states set their own standards. I want an accurate and understandable bill. Get rid of the fine print and 'gotcha' clauses in cell phone contracts.
- Help me compare offers when I'm shopping for service by requiring standard, plain language disclosures of prices and terms in an easy to use format, similar to nutrition labels on food or the required disclosures on credit card offers.
- Require carriers to provide useful coverage maps, or disclose in some manner "dead zones" that consumers are likely to encounter in their local calling area.
- Ensure I have real choice by enforcing the number portability deadline of November 2003, so I can keep my phone number if I change carriers
- Require carriers to grant new customers a reasonable trial period, allowing them to return the phone and cancel a service contract, without penalty, if they wish.
- Expand options for 911 use by requiring phones to use any strong analog signal available to it. Require the cell phone industry to stop dragging their feet in implementing wireless enhanced 911 (which will allow emergency call centers to locate callers.)

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Gregory Heller

From: Jossua Quintanilla
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 2, 2003 9:32 AM
Subject: FCC should do more re: wireless

Jossua Quintanilla
p.o. box 010392
Miami, FL 33101-0392

April 2, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

As a consumer, I believe the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) should do more to improve the services provided by wireless phone companies. Left on its own, the industry has not provided an acceptable level of service, and it will be great if you can switch from one cell company to another and keep your same phone number.

The FCC needs to:

- Set service and billing standards, or let states set their own standards. I want an accurate and understandable bill. Get rid of the fine print and 'gotcha' clauses in cell phone contracts.
- Help me compare offers when I'm shopping for service by requiring standard, plain language disclosures of prices and terms in an easy to use format, similar to nutrition labels on food or the required disclosures on credit card offers.
- Require carriers to provide useful coverage maps, or disclose in some manner "dead zones" that consumers are likely to encounter in their local calling area.
- Ensure I have real choice by enforcing the number portability deadline of November 2003, so I can keep my phone number if I change carriers.
- Require carriers to grant new customers a reasonable trial period, allowing them to return the phone and cancel a service contract, without penalty, if they wish.
- Expand options for 911 use by requiring phones to **use** any strong analog signal available to it. Require the cell phone industry to stop dragging their feet in implementing wireless enhanced 911 (which will allow emergency call centers to locate callers.)
- Switch cell phone companies and keeping the same phone number

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Jossua Quintanilla

From: Daniel Hurst Senter
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Mar 9, 2003 3:30 PM
Subject: Bright Eyed Student with Questions

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

My name is Dan Senter. I am from the San Francisco Bay Area and now am in my third year at Harvard. I'm emailing you because I liked the way you spoke at the Forum at Columbia (I viewed it via the internet), and was hoping that maybe we could speak on the phone sometime about ownership issues in the radio broadcast industry pre and post 1996.

I have been doing some preliminary research for my senior thesis in the area of Social Studies, and believe it will engage aspects of the current debate surrounding the 1996 legislation and its effects on musical diversity

I am personally very interested in studying whether or not diversity has decreased, but realize that there are so many ways to study this issue that it may be too large for me to tackle. I read the report regarding this issue of musical diversity by George Williams, Keith Brown, and Peter Alexander, which is on the FCC website. And while I admire that they actually looked at songs, I think that the study is rather limited, most obviously because it does not examine the effects of the legislation on smaller markets in the U.S. where competition may not be as high to begin with.

I noticed that you were interested in more rural communities, and was wondering if you had any theories or ideas about how I might approach studying some of these issues.

My gut feeling is that probably in smaller towns and cities, where perhaps there are less privately owned stations or college stations to offer alternatives, the youth has been especially influenced by the changes.

It seems that some of the problem with studying smaller markets in this way is obtaining the playlist data. Does the FCC have this stuff on file? Is it available to the public?

Sorry for the onslaught of questions and ideas.

I imagine you receive tons of email, but if you were willing to take some time out and respond either this way, or with a call, that would be awesome.

Thanks and keep up the debate,

Dan Senter

617-493- 3116

From: sarah kavage
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abemathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2003 5:25 PM
Subject: say no to deregulation!

Dear members of the FCC:

I am disappointed to hear that the FCC is even considering further deregulation of media outlets, and write this letter in the hope that my voice and others' will convince the commission that deregulation is not a good idea.

I believe there are good reasons for regulating the media. The media is not a typical industry - they wield a great deal of power, and with that power comes the responsibility to the public and the communities in which these industries serve. The further deregulation of broadcasting outlets would seriously undermine the democratic ideals this country was founded upon. The speed and degree with which radio has become consolidated after 1996's loosening of ownership rules was shocking, and commercial radio today makes a mockery of public interest, diversity and good journalism.

The fact that the FCC's consideration of further media deregulation has not made it into the news only serves to illustrate the point that further consolidation will increase filtering of news stories and further marginalize journalism that does not support the corporate media's political or economic priorities.

I cannot trust that corporations, as profit-seeking entities, will not seek to streamline, nationalize, and misrepresent if consolidation is allowed to continue. Pravda may be closer than we think.

Please, I urge you to vote against any additional media deregulations. Stand up for the real public's interest, not corporate interests.

Thanks,
Sarah Kavage
Seattle

=====

Sarah kavage
206-547-6433
www.gogoweb.com/kavage

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Tax Center - forms, calculators, tips, more
<http://taxesyahoo.com/>

From: Rob Meyer
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Mar 12, 2003 5:26 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Rob Meyer (classletter78@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I was pleased to be able to attend the Field Hearing at the University of Washington HUB last Friday, March 7th, 2003. I want to thank you and Commissioner Copps, whom I am also contacting (along with your other fellow Commissioners) for taking the time to come visit "the other Washington" and for paying no heed to Chairman Powell's derisive attitude towards public input.

As a twenty-year-plus broadcast news veteran, I have always believed in MORE not **less** regulation of broadcasters, who operate on our airways as part of a public trust. I used to joke, when I was an Associated Press Correspondent of the Year many moons ago, that I was the **ONLY** person in any of the news rooms where I worked (in Wisconsin, Missouri, New Mexico, Arizona, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Washington State) who favored tightening restrictions on media ownership and on public affairs content requirements.

Now, as Commissioner Copps put it, the genie may go out of the bottle completely. I was against the loosened regulations beginning with the Reagan Administration, and I opposed the Telecom Act of 1996. For all the reasons stated by the majority of the witnesses at Friday's hearings, not to mention the lessening of job opportunities in local radio news, I oppose the further consolidation of media ownership. Please do all you can to convince FCC members to join you and Commissioner Copps in turning down the mega-corporations lobbying...do not lessen the regulation of ownership and broadcast requirements.

Thank you for your time and attention

Sincerely,

Rob Meyer, Seattle, Washington

cc: FCC, U.S. Senators Cantwell and Murray, U.S. Reps. Jay Inslee and Jim McDermott, file

Server protocol: HTTP1.0
Remote host: 207.175.48.132
Remote IP address: 207.175.48.132

From: Lezlie Cox
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Mar 13, 2003 7:17 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Lezlie Cox (lezliecox@hotmail.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein.

Thank you for attending the March 7th Seattle hearing! I have reminded my representative and senators about the importance of citizen access to our public airwaves and the loss of **those** same airwaves to the monied few. Thank you again.

Sincerely,
Lezlie Cox

Server protocol: HTTP1.1
Remote host: 65.176.65.139
Remote IP address: 65.176.65.139

From: Doug Silver
To: Doug Silver
Date: Thu, Mar 20, 2003 10:46 AM
Subject: Media giant's rally sponsorship raises questions. This is another reason why media consolidation is

Sponsored by

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/showcase/chi-0303190157mar19.story>

Media giant's rally sponsorship raises questions

Advertisement

By Tim Jones
Tribune national correspondent

March 19, 2003

Some of the biggest rallies this month have endorsed President **Bush's** strategy against Saddam Hussein, and the common thread linking most of them is Clear Channel Worldwide Inc., the nation's largest owner of radio stations.

In a move that has raised eyebrows in some legal and journalistic circles, Clear Channel radio stations in Atlanta, Cleveland, San Antonio, Cincinnati and other cities have sponsored rallies attended by up to 20,000 people. The events have served as a loud rebuttal to the more numerous but generally smaller anti-war rallies.

The sponsorship of large rallies by Clear Channel stations is unique among major media companies, which have confined their activities in the war debate to reporting and occasionally commenting on the news. The San Antonio-based broadcaster owns more than 1,200 stations in 50 states and the District of Columbia.

While labor unions and special interest groups have organized and hosted rallies for decades, the involvement of a big publicly regulated broadcasting company breaks new ground in public demonstrations.

"I think this is pretty extraordinary," said former Federal Communications Commissioner Glen Robinson, who teaches law at the University of Virginia. "I can't say that this violates any of a broadcaster's obligations, but it sounds like borderline manufacturing of the news."

A spokeswoman for Clear Channel said the rallies, called "Rally for America," are the idea of Glenn Beck, a Philadelphia talk show host whose program is syndicated by Premier Radio Networks, a Clear Channel subsidiary.

'Just patriotic rallies'

A weekend rally in Atlanta drew an estimated 20,000 people, with some carrying signs reading "God Bless the USA and other signs condemning France and the group Dixie Chicks, one of whose members recently criticized President Bush.

"They're not intended to be pro-military. It's more of a thank you to the troops. They're just patriotic rallies," said Clear Channel spokeswoman Lisa Dollinger.

Rallies sponsored by Clear Channel radio stations are scheduled for this weekend in Sacramento, Charleston, S.C., and Richmond, Va. Although Clear Channel promoted two of the recent rallies on its corporate Web site, Dollinger said there is no corporate directive that stations organize rallies.

"Any rallies that our stations have been a part of have been of their own initiative and in response to the expressed desires of their listeners and communities," Dollinger said.

Clear Channel is by far the largest owner of radio stations in the nation. The company owned only 43 in 1995, but when Congress removed many of the ownership limits in 1996, Clear Channel was quickly on the highway to radio dominance. The company owns and operates 1,233 radio stations (including six in Chicago) and claims 100 million listeners. Clear Channel generated about 20 percent of the radio industry's \$16 billion in 2001 revenues.

Size sparks criticism

The media giant's size also has generated criticism. Some recording artists have charged that Clear Channel's dominance in radio and concert promotions is hurting the recording industry. Congress is investigating the effects of radio consolidation. And the FCC is considering ownership rule changes, among them changes that could allow Clear Channel to expand its reach.

Sen. Russell Feingold (D-Wis.) has introduced a bill that could halt further deregulation in the radio industry and limit each company's audience share and percent of advertising dollars. These measures could limit Clear Channel's meteoric growth and hinder its future profitability.

Jane Kirtley, a professor of media ethics and law at the University of Minnesota, said the company's support of the Bush administration's policy toward Iraq makes it "hard to escape the concern that this may in part be motivated by issues that Clear Channel has before the FCC and Congress."

Dollinger denied there is a connection between the rallies and the company's pending regulatory matters.

Rick Morris, an associate professor of communications at Northwestern University, said these actions by Clear Channel stations are a logical extension of changes in the radio industry over the last 20 years, including the blurring of lines between journalism and entertainment.

From a business perspective, Morris said, the rallies are a natural fit for many stations, especially talk-radio stations where hosts usually espouse politically conservative views.

"Nobody should be surprised by this," Morris said,

In 1987 the FCC repealed the Fairness Doctrine, which required broadcasters to cover controversial issues in their community and to do so by offering balancing views. With that obligation gone, Morris said, "radio can behave more like newspapers, with opinion pages and editorials."

"They've just begun stretching their legs, being more politically active," Morris said

Copyright (c) 2003, Chicago Tribune

Improved archives!

Searching [chicagotribune.com](http://www.chicagotribune.com/archives) archives back to 1985 is cheaper and easier than ever. New prices for multiple articles can bring your cost as low as 30 cents an article: <http://www.chicagotribune.com/archives>

From: Kathy McNamara
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Mar 20, 2003 6:07 PM
Subject: Media Deregulation

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am currently in the process of educating myself about the American media and I am extremely concerned about how news and information is handled in this country. **As** I am a new student of the subject I know there are a variety of things that are still beyond my grasp. But at this point I see that media consolidation does not serve to provide what the media is meant to do. Media outlets are a public resource intended to serve the communities to which they disseminate information. Deregulation serves to take care of the massive corporations (and their interests) which own the media.

As I said, I am deeply concerned about this issue and will continue to learn more about the subject. In the meantime I ask that you work to oppose deregulation. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kathleen McNamara
714 1st Ave N.
Seattle, WA 98109

From: Laura Mac Donald
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Mar 21, 2003 5:24 PM
Subject: easing ownership rules

Dear FCC:

I would beg you not to ease ownership rules of media outlets any further. If you want to **see** what the result will be, simply look to Canada where newsrooms are now shared between print and television, where reporters are afraid to write critical pieces on any subject, including showbusiness pap, for fear of reprisals at the national outlets, and where editorial policies are handed down across a broad swathe of diverse populations without regard for their choice. At a certain point, when local media outlets are replaced by large corporate interests, the uniformity of voice becomes a drone. Local newsgathering goes down the tubes. **It's** not only a threat to what makes America vibrant and full of surprise, it threatens our cultural development and diversity, something we all benefit from both in our **lives** and in our banks. The media is not like an insurance company. It thrives on many different levels in different ways and is a delicate balance of voices and ideas. To homogenize it any further puts **us** at risk. It creates a level of suspicion and fear in both its workers and its audience. Young Americans are putting their lives on the line fighting for freedom in other countries. Don't give it away in our own.

L. MacDonald

From: Dan Erlandson
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 23, 2003 2:31 PM
Subject: FCC Consolidation Considerations

Dan Erlandson
18025 14th Ave Ne
Shoreline, WA 98155-3737

March 23, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St **SW**
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chair Powell:

Dear sir:

I object strongly to any further consolidation of media ownership, and feel that, if ANYTHING, there should be INCREASED regulation of such

Sincerely,

Dan Erlandson

From: MojoinColorado@netscape.net
To: undisclosed-recipients
Date: Mon, Mar 24, 2003 12:02 AM
Subject: Retention of cross ownership rules

Dear Sir,

I am deeply concerned by the consolidation of media companies (radio and newspaper) and the low standard of public service currently performed by private companies (whether publicly traded or not) using the airwaves owned by the American people.

I live in the Denver Colorado area and have observed the degradation of service since the 'radio market share rules' were relaxed a few years ago. Instead of a variety of radio stations that offered true choices and distinction in both the quality of entertainment and news (both in content and in editorial style & viewpoint), I am now relegated to mediocrity in both general categories.

Instead of unique music (not always good -- but that's what choice gives you) and a choice of play list stations, now all I have are play list stations that are 2 songs an hour different from each other (sometimes they are so repetitive that they even repeat the morning show in the late afternoon/early evening, and many do on Saturday's).

As for the news, I can follow the VERY SAME newscaster and the VERY SAME traffic observer from one station to the other (sometimes it's a goal just to **see** if I can). That removes all objectivity, independence, and even actual news reporters out there gathering data.

Not to mention any corporate influences to support causes and or candidates for public office via control of the newsroom (of 8 outlets at once).

As to the financials of this, with just two or three major companies controlling the vast majority of the market, they can set ad rates. Already Clear Channel appears to set the ad times so that they are suspiciously at or almost at the same time. How do I know? I am scanning channels to avoid them because they control so much of the time and have such large blocks of ads. I can only speculate they also editorialize whom they will let advertise.

In the Denver area (and as a result, most of the state of Colorado) we have the result of the consolidation of two large metropolitan/state wide newspapers into one holding company (a 'Joint Operating Agreement').

The end result is that ad rates went up many multitudes, as did my subscription rate (from \$7/year/6 days a week to \$52/year). Part of the merger included only printing one paper on Saturday's and Sunday's (less service -- more money?!). In addition, ad policies have become political to the point that at least one category is limited beyond the scope of law (firearms ads are now limited to licensed dealers only). With only one company, and a soon to be completed move to only one building, what independent, even opposing, editorial content can I continue to expect? Hmm?

In short, I would like to see a reversal of some of the changes made in the last few years to make LARGE businessmen happy for their bottom line, and a return to public broadcasters having some commitment and responsibility to the public whose airwaves they **use**. And yes, this means I support the regulations we have on cross ownership, if not tighter laws.

Try AOL and get 1045 hours FREE for 45 days!
<http://free.aol.com/tryaolfree/index.adp?375380>

Get AOL Instant Messenger 5.1 for FREE! Download Now!

<http://aim.aol.com/aimnew/Aim/register.adp?promos=380455>

From: Joyce Williams
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Mar 24, 2003 4:04 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Joyce Williams (jlw31@prodigy.net) writes:

Sir: College Club group studing **Media..why** is your term over in June? How long are other commissioners' terms?**We're** concerned over media ownership concentrated in fewer and fewer major 'players.'

Server protocol: HTTPII. I
Remote host: 65.56.6.253
Remote IP address: 65.56.6.253

From: Grant Dunham
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Mar 25, 2003 12:40 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Grant Dunham (grantdunham@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I urge you to prevent any further erosion in regulations on broadcast station ownership. The danger to the public interest was demonstrated recently when Clear Channel Communications used its powerful national radio network to promote one-sided political rallies in favor of the war. They then reported the rallies as news.

Further consolidation would allow more such abuse of the public airwaves

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.73.33.68
Remote IP address: 64.73.33.68

From: sarajlewis@hotmail.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Mar 25, 2003 5:35 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Sara Lewis
698 Blackford Ct.
San Jose, California 95117

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Mike Honda

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Tue, Mar 25, 2003 5:35 PM
Subject: Fwd: Protect Children's Television!

From: sarajlewis@hotmail.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Mar 25, 2003 5:35 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Sara Lewis
698 Blackford Ct.
San Jose, California 95117

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Mike Honda

From: Mark Smith
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Mar 25, 2003 9:02 PM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mark H. Smith
Boise. ID 83709

From: Mark Smith
To: Michael Copps
Date: Tue, Mar 25, 2003 9:02 PM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mark H. Smith
Boise. ID 83709

From: Mark Smith
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Mar 25, 2003 9:02 PM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mark H. Smith
Boise, ID 83709